CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICIES COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTICE

Friday, July 26, 2013
1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

Mike Rossi
Chair

California Workforce Investment Board
Conference Room
777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-3363

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

AGENDA

Additional Meeting Locations

South Bay Workforce Investment Board
11539 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 500
Hawthorne, CA 90250
Sheryl Singh: 310 970 7700

Hospitality Training Academy
UNITE HERE, Local 11 Office
464 S. Lucas Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
818 321-8843

Riverside Workforce Investment Board
1325 Spruce Street, 4th Floor, Room 4A
Riverside, CA
Rilla Jacobs: 951 955 3053

Jewish Vocational Services
225 Bush Street, Suite 400, West Lobby
San Francisco, CA 94104
415 782 6244

1. **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

2. **Action:**
   a. Approve January 7, 2013 Meeting Summary
   b. Approve ETPL Policy Revision
   c. Approve Additional Performance Measures

3. **Updates:**
   a) Local Plan Review Process
   b) Branding of the Workforce System
   c) High Concentration Youth – Career Technical Training Grants

4. **Discussion:**
   a. Review of Priority Activities and Determine Next Steps
   b. State Plan Approval and Implementation Activities

5. **Other Business**

6. **Public Comment**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at http://www.cwib.ca.gov or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.

CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICIES COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTICE

Friday, July 26, 2013
1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

Mike Rossi
Chair

California Workforce Investment Board
Conference Room
777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-3363

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

Participants are encouraged to attend the meeting in one of the 5 locations identified in this agenda. For future reference, locations not included in the agenda will not participate in the discussions.

Topic: CWIB Issues & Policies Committee
Date: Friday, July 26, 2013
Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Webex Meeting Link
Meeting Number: 741 615 344
Meeting Password: 77712
Attendee access code: 613 254 1

To join the teleconference only

Call-in number (Verizon): 1-866-748-2780 (US)

For assistance

1. Go to https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/mc
2. On the left navigation bar, click "Support".

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This WebEx service includes a feature that allows audio and any documents and other materials exchanged or viewed during the session to be recorded. By joining this session, you automatically consent to such recordings. If you do not consent to the recording, discuss your concerns with the meeting host prior to the start of the recording or do not join the session. Please note that any such recordings may be subject to discovery in the event of litigation.

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at http://www.cwib.ca.gov or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.

Item 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Item 2. Action Items

a. Approval of January 7, 2013 Meeting Summary

b. Approval of Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) policy revision

c. Approval of Additional Performance Measures recommendations

Issues and Policies Committee
Meeting Summary
January 7, 2013

Members Present:
John Brauer
Bill Camp
Pam Harris
Stewart Knox
Cris McCullough (for Van Ton-Quinlivan – not considered for quorum)
Nathan Nayman
Robin Purdy
Diane Ravnik
Jeremy Smith
Alma Salazar (telephone)
Alan Fernandez Smith (telephone)
Felicia Flournoy (telephone)
Bruce Stenslie (telephone)
Joseph Williams (telephone)
Stephen Baiter (telephone)
Blake Konczal (telephone)
Steven Levy (telephone)

Members Absent:
CDE Representative
Ken Burt
Stan Diorio
Nick Schultz
Abby Snay

Staff Present:
Tim Rainey, Executive Director
Douglas Sale, Chief of Operations
Daniel Patterson, Administrative Manager
Michelle Green, Analyst
Jessica Dailey, Analyst
Tom Bates, Analyst
Michael Dowdy, IT Systems Analyst

Public Present:
Zak Ford, Sacramento Central Labor Council
Deane Toler, Geographic Solutions
Michael Evashenk, Employment Development Department
Barbara Halsey, California Workforce Association
Christine Welsch, SETA/SWCC
Carol Padovan, U.S. DOL (telephone)

DRAFT

John Delmatier, Proteus (telephone)
Quorum established

Item 1 - Welcome and Opening Remarks:
The Issues and Policy Committee (IPC) Chair, Bill Camp, welcomed members to the meeting, requested members identify themselves for the record and reviewed the agenda. Diane Ravnik introduced herself; Bill stated she was a new member to the committee.

Item 2a – Approval of the November 13, 2012 Meeting Summary:
Several amendments made to correct/revise – Robin Purdy motioned to accept the meeting summary, as revised; Nathan Nayman seconded; motion passed unanimously.

Item 2b – Approval of the ETPL Policy Revision, Concepts, Timeline and Formation of Ad Hoc Workgroup:
Tim Rainey provided a status update and reiterated the five (5) recommended responsibilities the ad hoc committee should assume. The IPC expressed interest in having state-approved apprenticeships automatically added to the ETPL, to ensure quality of programs (including community college classes), and the need to develop eligibility criteria.

Bill Camp called for volunteers for the ETPL Ad Hoc Committee membership; the following people agreed to serve: Jeremy Smith, John Brauer, Diane Ravnik, Diane Factor, Robin Purdy, Cris McCullough, Kris Stadleman, Alma Salazar, Blake Konczal, Stewart Knox, Barbara Halsey, Carol Padovan, and an EDD representative (Michael Evashenk to appoint).

Jeremy Smith motioned to accept the item; John Brauer seconded; motion was unanimously approved.

Item 2c – Approval to Form a Performance Measures Ad Hoc Workgroup to Identify Additional Performance Measures:
Tim Rainey provided a status update and reiterated the recommended actions with regard to the ad hoc committee's responsibilities. John Brauer suggested the ad hoc membership contain representatives from manufacturing, green jobs, and healthcare. Tim Rainey advised all State Board committees (Standing, Special, and Ad Hoc) are focused on performance measure criteria and outcomes. The Committee identified the following items to be considered as additional performance measures: performance measures beyond the required common measures; measurement and comparison of outcomes; the creation of a useful dashboard, and the development of eligibility criteria.

Bill Camp called for volunteers for the Performance Measures (High Performance) Ad Hoc Committee. The following people agreed to serve: Stephen Baiter, Stewart Knox, Nathan Nayman, Robin Purdy, Jeremy Smith, Abby Snay, John Brauer, Carol Padovan, Barbara Halsey, Joseph Williams, Alma Salazar, Felicia Flournoy, and an EDD representative (Michael Evashenk to appoint).

DRAFT

Jeremy Smith motioned to accept the item; Nathan Nayman seconded; motion was unanimously approved.

Item 2d – Approval to Form an Ad Hoc Workgroup on the Future of the One-Stop Center in California:
Tim Rainey discussed how the idea of this ad hoc and justification came about (a plenary panel at the 2012 CWA Spring Conference).

John Brauer spoke that Los Angeles needed to participate, as they have a lot of creative programs and potential models.

Bill Camp called for volunteers for the One-Stop Ad Hoc Committee. The following people agreed to serve: Alma Salazar, Abby Snay, Cindy Chavez, Sandy Harmsen, Pam Harris, Jamil Dada, John Brauer, Larry Frank, Robin Purdy, Nick Shultz, Alan Fernandez Smith, Bruce Stenslie, Steven Levy, Carol Padovan, Cris McCullough, Felicia Flournoy, Joseph Williams, Barbara Halsey, Josie Camacho, a representative from EDD, and Lorena Gonzales.

Jeremy Smith motioned to approve the item, Robin Purdy seconded; motion was unanimously approved.

Item 2e – Approval of the Committee Mission Statement:
There was a great deal of discussion and numerous amendments to the IPC Mission Statement. Concerns were brought forward with regard to the following items: the definition and examples of “middle-skill occupations”; the need for sensitivity to disabled workers (e.g. low skill occupations); job placements; and accountability.
It was agreed that the above concerns should be addressed as performance standards.

The final version of the document was amended to read: “Issues and Policies Special Committee Mission Statement: our mission is to provide advice, counsel and recommendations to the full California Workforce Investment Board that improve Local Workforce Investment Boards’ ability to increase the number of industry-valued skills and number of people placed in middle-skill occupations in sectors with the best potential for jobs that provide economic security now and in the future; and to provide overall strategic recommendations to the full Board in identifying the most critical policy priorities.”

Pam Harris made the original motion to accept the changes; Jeremy Smith seconded the motion. Numerous friendly amendments were made to the language. Pam Harris and Jeremy Smith accepted the amendments and the Committee unanimously approved the amended Mission Statement.

Item 3a – State Plan Update and Regional Forums:
Tim Rainey provided update and reiterated the 3-month extension of submission to DOL and stated the Employment Training Panel has been involved. Several Committee

DRAFT

members commented that the document was well-written. Questions were raised with regard to the document's alignment with DOL policies and goals; Tim Rainey advised that DOL has been very helpful in working with the State Board and that the plan does align with DOL and the "President's Educational Blueprint". Tim will provide the website address of the document to the Committee.

Tim Rainey advised the forums were to take place beginning Tuesday, January 8th and conclude on February 8th, 2013. The number of participants (per forum) will be capped at 25. Discussion items will include training requirements and ETPL funds.

Item 3b – AB 554 Activities:
Tim Rainey discussed the intent of Local Plan Technical Assistance Sessions and reiterated the dates. The first session (September, 2012) had about 50 attendees. Tim advised the next meeting was February 5th, in Concord. Attendees for these regional events should include state and local level approved-apprenticeship training coordinators. John Brauer suggested a template that included standards/elements be created for use by the local boards; the local boards would have a real working agreement that would be DAS-approved and could be used with other entities, such as the Community Colleges. Bill Camp suggested the need for a broader view with regard to career ladders (e.g. healthcare and education). Diane Ravnik agreed and advised SETA (Robin Purdy) has a very good model that other local boards might want to use. She stated there are 800 different apprenticeship occupations and the one of the DAS policy goals is to expand this model. She agreed an element template for all local boards would be good and hopes that Community College participation (e.g. Adult Education) would be included. Robin Purdy stated representatives from Community Colleges and NoRTEC met to share ideas and develop ideas on how to build relationships and develop co-enrollment. The resulting Memorandum of Understanding was approved; they are currently working on implementation.

Item 3c – Senate Bill 1401:
Tim Rainey advised that the State Plan has been modeled on SB 1401 and Senator Lieu intends to re-introduce the language. Bill Camp asked if the IPC can make legislative recommendations to the State Board; Tim advised the Governor's Office does not want the State Board to take positions on legislation. Nathan Nayman asked if (and how) the IPC can provide feedback to the legislators (with specific regard to SB 1401). Tim advised that when the IPC has feedback, he will find the process. He reiterated that the author and his designee are active members of the State Board and the IPC. Pam Harris stated that the SB 1401 was good, but suggested that the State College and University systems needed to be included. Tim commented that staff could bring a proposal of "next steps" back to the Committee. There was discussion of the on-going need across local boards and regions/sectors for skills gap analyses. Tim advised this is a topic that all State Board committees are looking at. Nathan Nayman commented that the state needs to be proactive with companies outside the state, as well as those in the state. He stated that companies are relocating or not coming to California because they cannot find the appropriate skilled labor. Committee comments included the need to think proactively about future skills gaps, as well as current.

DRAFT

Nathan advised there are issues around the types of graduates coming out, as well as job growth outside the state (e.g. lots of engineers graduating and companies relocating to where they are). A question was raised that the IPC might focus on this opportunity to research and find models from other cities and states; members agreed. John Brauer suggested to start with GoBIZ and check on how businesses attracted to California and maintained. Nathan Nayman agreed on the need for the state to do skills gap analyses, especially with jobs being lost due to lack of skills.

Item 3d – Local Planning Guidance and High Performing Board Criteria:
Tim Rainey reiterated the details from the last IPC meeting and asked the Committee to check the last meeting's summary to make sure all the changes have been incorporated. There were no comments or additional discussion.

Item 4 – California Workforce System System (CWSN) Status:
An update was provided by Michael Evashenk (EDD) and Deane Toler (Geographic Solutions). The new system is replacing two legacy systems of data collection and case management for both Wagner-Peyser and WIA programs: CalJOBS and Job Training Automation system. Michael stated that a great deal of multi-partner, collaborative feedback occurred in the design and implementation of the system, with specific interest in tracking and management of performance outcomes and training dollars. Phase One - The Virtual One-Stop system is already operating other states; California will be the 17th. The CalJOBS phase will go live in March, 2013 and will include a self-service piece for employers and jobseekers, and the capability of intensive case management through tracking of Wagner-Peyser, WIA, Trade Act, other federal reporting methods, and operational expenses.
Bill Camp raised the question of how the cost of healthcare is calculated. Michael Evashenk advised it is not tracked. The Committee discussed the possible need to add the cost of healthcare into the reporting, as it is now federally-mandated; Michael Evashenk suggested this option could be explored through performance standards and future discussions of the base-wage file calculations. Diane Ravnik endorsed the idea and suggested that EDD ((or another entity) look at models that capture this.

Blake Konczal asked for the date Phase Two will begin and commented on the need to look at how the data was reported back; the federal standards should be considered the mandated minimums, not the "ceiling". He believes we need to make sure the federal standards are included but that we also work above that minimum. John Brauer advised that the state plan covers this issue and commented that the different systems and departments are now talking to each other about the data. Deane Toler advised there are no details available on the Phase 2 roll-out, including a date. Deane also advised that the system was constantly evolving, based on solicited local feedback and input. It was stated that version 12 was now available; Bill Camp advised the local boards should be notified. Blake Konczal asked if there was a "moving target" date for Phase 2 roll-out; Michael Evashenk advised there is no date yet.

Joseph Williams asked the following questions on user capabilities: 1) does the platform have mobile capabilities (e.g. smartphones); 2) is the system compatible with ONet or

DRAFT

others; and 3) will it replace the local board's current systems. Deane Toler advised: 1) there is mobile accessibility and that Geographic Solutions is also working on a mobile application; 2) all ONet standards and matching is used; and 3) it will replace the current local board systems.

Cris McCullough commented that the Community Colleges have a lot of challenges, as there are many new accountability and report-outs and asked if it would be valuable for that system. Deane Toler advised they are working with the Community Colleges (Susan Coleman) in creating a "portal" in the system specifically for their outcome reporting. He also stated that the company was working on an ETP component.

Felicia Flournoy asked if the Policy and Implementation committee was going to begin meeting again and was advised by Michael Evashenk that it would be convening in the near future.

Item 5 – Other Business
Tim Rainey raised the issue of WIA 25% Policy and advised there are discussions around the use of discretionary funding for additional assistance. The current policy actually limits the Governor's discretion and is very prescriptive in the definition of "events" eligible for funding. Tim feels the IPC and State Board need to look closer at the types of events that can be included in the additional assistance funding. As there is a need for maximum flexibility, it was suggested that new policy language be brought forward to the January 25, 2013 Executive Committee meeting for their consideration. Pam Harris agreed that additional clarification to the policy would be welcomed, due to the Bureau of Audit findings on the topic.

Item 6 – Public Comment
None

Meeting was adjourned at 11:14 am.

DRAFT

Action:
The Issues and Policies Committee (IPC) of the California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) is asked to approve the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) policy points outlined below. These recommendations are the result of the ETPL ad hoc Committee work.

Background
In January 2013, the IPC formed the ETPL ad hoc Committee. Its membership included representatives from a broad list of stakeholders. The Committee was tasked with addressing the following items:

a) Identify the minimum performance standards for private postsecondary education training providers to be included on the ETPL. Local boards can develop more stringent local performance requirements for their training providers approved locally,

b) Develop administrative processes to ensure BPPE and its reporting system is leveraged and that ETPL providers adhere to BPPE requirements,

c) Determine minimum performance standards for DAS-registered apprenticeship programs and the administrative process for their inclusion on the ETPL,

d) Establish procedures to ensure the ongoing management of the ETPL and that training providers maintain performance standards, and

e) Ensure the role and responsibilities of local boards outlined in WIA are maintained.

The Committee met twice and provided input on draft documents developed by committee staff. The resulting policy revision addresses all the issues outlined above. This policy establishes statewide minimum performance standards for all three categories below and specifies that training programs must be in demand industry sectors that have been identified either through the local planning process or the state economic analysis. All ETPL programs to be subject to an annual performance review to ensure only quality training programs are included and remain listed on the ETPL. Specifically, the policy revision requires:

Private Postsecondary Training Programs: Must meet and maintain a 70% placement rate for all eligible graduates in that program. Training must be for occupations in priority sectors identified in the State plan and/or local area plans. Training must result in completion/receipt of an industry recognized credential, certificate, or degree, including all industry appropriate licensing and/or certification requirements.

Definition of Placement Rate for BPPE Approved Programs: Placement is measured six months from the graduation date of each student, and reports all students in the program compared to those who have gained employment in the field of study. This calculation excludes students who meet specific exclusion criteria (e.g. death, incarceration, active military duty, continued education beyond graduation, etc.)

California Community College Programs: Must achieve and maintain a 70% certificate or credential attainment rate overall, and a 70% Placement Rate in training-related employment for WIA enrolled students in that program. . Training must be for occupations in priority sectors identified in the State plan and/or local area plans. Training must result in completion/receipt of an industry recognized credential, certificate, or degree, including all industry appropriate licensing and/or certification requirements.

This category of program will not be subject to the initial performance standard. However, the performance will be applied to these programs in subsequent years.

DAS Registered Apprenticeship Program: Maintain a 70% Apprenticeship Completion rate.

Definition of Completion Rate for DAS Programs: State-registered apprenticeship programs, which have had at least two (2) graduating classes, which have had an annual apprentice completion rate of at least 70% of the average completion rate, for two (2) consecutive years for the applicable trade or occupation, as verified by the State Division of Apprenticeship Standards.

Implications

a) The policy ensures the state requirements for training providers, subject to registration and approval to operate by BPPE, are properly vetted and comply with annual performance reporting requirements to BPPE.

b) The policy provides a documented method to review performance, both for the initial determination and an annual performance assessment, to list and retain only those programs that maintain the state's minimum level of performance.

c) The policy implements administrative solutions to list programs offered by the campuses of the California Community College system as well as apprenticeship programs registered with the Department of Industrial Relations.

d) Some providers, with history of providing training services to WIA clients may not have registered or have not received approval to operate by

BPPE. This could result in some providers that provide quality training programs being removed from the list, pending their approval by BPPE. The policy includes a transition period to January 1, 2014 to ensure all providers listed on the ETPL are properly registered and approved to operate by BPPE.

e) The list will be reviewed annually by the state and local boards. The timelines associated with this performance review are outlined in Steps b-h below. If programs do not meet the performance standards, the local board will notify them of their removal from the ETPL. The State Board will also remove training programs if they have not complied with BPPE's annual report card requirement. The policy also includes detailed instructions regarding notification and appeal procedures.

Timeline

a) September 2013
DRAFT Policy Directive is published for 30-day public comment period. Training Providers are required to submit their Annual Report of Performance to BPPE.

b) December 2013
EDD provides lists of providers by local area, to local boards for review and subsequent eligibility determination.

c) February 2014
Local boards complete the local review of training providers and subsequent eligibility determination and forward the list to EDD.

d) March/April 2014
Local boards notify the providers that have been delisted and provide information on appeal procedures.

e) March/April 2014
EDD shall verify with BPPE that reporting requirements have been satisfied, retain all providers that meet the performance criteria and delist all providers that do not meet the performance requirements.

f) May 2014
EDD shall notify the providers that have been removed from the ETPL due to noncompliance with BPPE reporting requirements and provide information on the appeal process. EDD will also notify local boards of training providers that have been removed from the ETPL to ensure that referrals are no longer made to that program.

g) June 2014
EDD will update the ETPL and republish the list.

Next Steps
Upon approval of these policy criteria by the Committee, they will be forwarded to the Executive Committee and State Board for their review and approval during their upcoming meetings scheduled for August 9 and 13, 2013.

A draft policy directive will be issued in September 2013 for a 30-day public comment period. The final policy will be issued in October 2013.

Action Requested
The Issues and Policy Committee (IPC) of the California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) is asked to approve additional performance measures and implementation timeline for all Local Workforce Investment Boards (local boards) and their service providers. These measures will be used to evaluate High-Performing local board designation in FY 2015/16, and extend to activities funded by WIA formula, discretionary, and leveraged dollars.

Background

On May 8, 2013, the State Board, through the work of an ad hoc subcommittee of the Issues and Policy Committee, approved seven "additional" performance measures for use in evaluating customer and system progress. These measures complement and further define the WIA common measures that are standard for the California system (these include job placement, job retention, and income increases for adult and dislocated workers, and placement in employment or education, skills increases, and certificate or degree attainment for youth). In selecting these measures, it was the State Board's intention to create measurements that are directly tied to the goals of the State and local strategic plans, and tailored to reflect meaningful outcomes for jobseekers, workers, and employers.
Guiding principles for these measures- They should be:

- Easily explainable to a lay audience
- Applicable to different geographical and institutional areas of interest
- Create a level playing field among programs and service strategies
- Promote behaviors that lead to the desired outcomes
- Result in sustainable practices and efficient use of resources without compromising quality
- Methodologically sound
- Difficult to game or manipulate

The State Board requested that staff further define measurements, timeline for implementation, and implications.

See attached for Additional Performance Measurement Definitions.

Implications and Timeline

<u>When do we start counting?</u>
Local boards will be required to begin collecting and entering data on the above criteria on January 1, 2014. A six month pilot period will follow (through June 30, 2014), in order to ensure that staff at local One Stops and training providers as well as the Employment Development Department performance management unit have adequate training, and that technical issues, definitions, and/or other aspects of the new measures can be adjusted or addressed. At the beginning of FY 2014/15, all

additional performance measures and data collection requirements will be fully implemented.

What will we count?
Baseline for each of the performance measures will be established both State-wide (collective goals), and for individual local boards (similar to the process used for the WIA Common Measures). A minimum threshold for performance will be established, and performance goals for each local board will be negotiated on an annual basis. These will reflect a numeric or percentage increase, and be evaluated based on progress toward goal.

How will we use this data?
These performance measures will be a criteria used to determine High Performing local board designation beginning in FY 2015/16. In order to be considered for High Performing status, local boards will need to meet or exceed the performance goals in the majority of the measures.

Next Steps

Between August 2013 and January 1, 2014, State Board staff will work with local board directors, staff, and members to further define measurements (including ***what*** is counted, ***when*** in a service delivery cycle information is captured, and ***how*** progress is measured), the process for implementation, and individual benchmarking pilot efforts. This process will result in formal guidance and direction on how data is to be reported and evaluated.

What is the Policy Goal?	How Will Success Be Measured?	How is the Measure Defined?	What Are the Details?
Increase the number of Californians with the skills necessary to compete in today's economy.	Attainment of Industry-Valued Credentials	Certificates and credentials that enable students to enter middle skill jobs or career pathways. *Credentials/certificates recognized by employers, trade associations, and licensing entities as meeting occupational requirements and used in hiring decisions.*	"Industry –Valued" are those certificates, degrees, or credentials (C/D/C) that are necessary to: • Enter into an occupation, without which the job seeker would not be allowed to practice or is at a disadvantage in the application process. • Enter into an occupation at a substantially higher wage rate than applicants w/o the C/D/C. • Advance in an occupation or along a career path, as evidenced by wage gain or job advancement (e.g. title change, scope of work change).
Increase the number of Californians who earn enough to make ends meet.	Placement in Quality Jobs (living wage jobs)	Jobs that meet a minimum threshold for wage and/or benefits. *A living wage is a wage that is high enough to maintain a decent standard of living (adequate food, shelter, and other necessities). Living wage varies based on the area-specific cost of living.*	Quality jobs are those that meet or exceed the Self Sufficiency Standard or Lower Living Standard Income Level for a single adult for the county in which the job is located. This will be measured by the hourly wage at placement.
Increase the number of Californians with jobs and careers in high-demand, priority industries in the regional or State economy.	Placement in Targeted Industry Sectors	Occupations in priority industry sectors as identified by the State Board or local WIBs. *Sectors may be high-demand (new jobs or replacement job openings), high-wage, or represent a critical or emerging role in the State/local economy.*	Defined as placement of unemployed job seeker in a job in the priority industry, transition of an employed worker (in a different industry) to a job in priority industry sector, or advancement of current industry worker into new occupation in the same priority industry sector.

What is the Policy Goal?	How Will Success Be Measured?	How is the Measure Defined?	What Are the Details?
Increase the income of Californians who participate in workforce services and/or training.	Return on Investment	Expenditures for workforce services as compared against outcomes achieved.	Defined as income increase for workers placed in a new job or advanced to a new occupation as a result of services delivered through the local WIB. Return on Investment will be measured by the ratio between workforce service cost as compared to income change.
Increase the value of the workforce system to businesses/employers.	Employer Engagement & Employer Investment	Employers are active partners in and customers of workforce services, and provide meaningful contributions – financial and in-kind- to programs.	Measurement of the: • Percentage of employers who are repeat customers of the local workforce system, and/or • Increase in the dollar value of percentage of total budget from employer contribution to training, internships, equipment, or other services.
Increase the responsiveness of the workforce system to local, regional, and State-wide economic conditions.	Industry Sector Partnerships	Collaboration among workforce system providers, educational and training institutions, labor, and employers that target the supply and demand gaps (hiring, training, productivity, diversity, etc.) in targeted industries.	Increase in the number and /or strength of industry sector partnerships, as measured by: • Number or percentage of workers hired from sector programs. • Number or percentage of credentials achieved for sector program graduates. • Improvement in sector employer/industry outcomes (increased productivity, decrease time to hire, etc.)
Increase the impact of the workforce system and limit duplication of services.	Alignment of Funding Streams	Local and/or regional funding decisions are reflective of workforce system goals.	Funding that is dedicated to workforce system performance and outcome measures defined in the local WIB plan (including those listed here), as measured by the percentage of total LWIB budget.

Item 3. Updates

a. Local Plan Review Process

On July 1, 2013 the State Board received all 49 Local Plans. On July 12, 2013, The State Board hosted a technical assistance training for all reviewers of the Local Strategic Plan. This training focused on the review process, and focused on the key vision and strategy portions of the plans. In addition, a tutorial was presented on the Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). FAAST is an online product that will be used to read, review, score, and comment on Local Plans. .

A total of 33 reviewers have volunteered to read, review and score the Local Plan, with each being assigned 4-5 proposals. The review period is from July 16 through August 16, 2013. During this period, staff will be monitoring daily progress and looking for irregularities in scoring or other areas of concern. The results are scheduled to be announced October 1, 2013.

b. Branding of California's Workforce System

In October 2012 the State Board approved the use of the above logo for implementing the re-branding of California's WIA funded One-Stop system. Since that time communication efforts with the Employment Development Department and Local Areas has been ongoing. The Local Areas were provided a branding toolkit which included materials and instructions on how to ensure local participation in this statewide effort.

In addition, the AJCC web portal, americasjobcenter.ca.gov was launched on July 1, 2013. The portal is the hub of the branding effort. It is a portal that is both user-friendly and accessible for both the job seeker and employer, it also available via mobile devices. The AJCC web portal is an access point where jobs can be searched, local success stories are posted, job openings can be listed and both job seekers and employers can read about trends and other stories

regarding the workforce community. The goal is that this portal becomes the centrifugal component in linking workforce partners and agencies, connecting training opportunities with jobs, providing employer services and a skilled workforce to the employer community.

c. High Concentration Youth – Career Technical Training Grants

The State Board solicited Local Areas that have high concentration of eligible youth, to submit applications to expand existing youth focused manufacturing programs. The total amount of funding available was $900,000. This funding is purposed to continue to serve current students, while also increasing their capacity to serve an additional 60-70 students through their programs. This effort will prepare students for certification in the various facets of the manufacturing field. Successful applications described the following:

- *Partnership with an established Career Technical Education Pathways program*.
- *Clear plan for implementing "Earn-and-Learn" or other "bridges" to employment in advanced manufacturing*.
- *Collaboration with a skills credentialing entity*.
- *Broad stakeholder buy-in*.
- *Development of an industry sector partnership in advanced manufacturing.*

Four Grants were awarded to the following partnerships:

Oakland/Alameda Youth Manufacturing Partnership received $238,750;

San Bernardino Workforce Board in cooperation with San Bernardino Valley College, NTMA Training Centers of Southern California and various manufacturing employers received $213.750;

South Bay Workforce Investment Board in cooperation with El Camino College Career Advancement Career Academy received $213,750;

Stanislaus County Alliance Worknet in accordance with Modesto Junior College and Ceres High School's Green and Clean Manufacturing Academy received $213,750.

Updates to the progress of these projects will be provided during regularly scheduled meetings.

Item 4. Discussion

a. Review of Priority Activities and Determine Next Steps

b. State Plan Approval and Implementation Activities

Item 5. Other Business

Item 6. Public Comment

Issues and Policies Committee Initiatives

In January 2012 the IPC identified the following policy priorities and established ad hoc committees to develop the necessary guidance and implementation strategies.

1. Develop and implement One-Stop Center Branding Policy – to include use of statewide workforce system logo (Complete)

2. Revise ETPL policy to establish performance criteria, incorporate BPPE requirement and the listing of community college programs and state registered apprenticeship programs (Complete)

3. Develop and launch workforce system portal for accessing workforce system services and information (Complete)

4. Identify and develop additional performance measures to more effectively measure local performance, investment in training and placement in demand occupations (Complete)

5. Review and consider the Integrated Services Delivery Evaluation recommendations

6. Increase use and flexibility of the 25% Additional Assistance fund

Also in January 2012 the IPC formed an ad hoc committee to discuss the recommendations of the ISD Evaluation Report and its impact on the development of service delivery strategies in through the One-Stop Centers. The work on this committee was delayed pending the completion of other higher priority work. Several IPC members have already volunteered to participate on the ad hoc group. The staff will confirm its first meeting date and will report back to the IPC at its next scheduled meeting.

25% Rapid Response Fund
Staff will work with EDD and local partners to evaluate the current policy governing the use of these funds and to make recommendations back to the IPC on necessary changes. Recommendations will ensure the Governor maintains the flexibility to maximize the use of these funds to implement strategies to achieve the goals outlined in the State Workforce Development Plan. That Committee will also be formed in the next several weeks to begin that work.